REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over WO 98/16886 or U.S. patent 5,959,536 to Srivastava et al. (herein "Srivastava") in view of the newly cited publication "In Home" Digital Networks And Cordless Options to Eilley (herein "Eilley").

Applicants first note the statement for the rejection on page 3 of the Office Action cites U.S. patent 5,959,536 as corresponding to the Srivastava reference. However, that reference corresponds to the cited patent to Chambers. It appears the basis for the outstanding rejection is only directed to Srivastava in WO 98/16886 based on the statements for the rejection. If applicants' understanding is wrong, clarification is requested.

Addressing the above-noted rejection, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

The claims are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now clarifies that the processing unit can voluntarily recognize one communication node on the first network as one of constituent elements that constitute the communication node and discloses its own configuration information regarding what its constituent elements are to another communication node on the second network through the second interface unit such that the one communication node is recognized as a part of the communication node on a second network by the another communication node "on the second network while said one communication node is actually operating on the first network". The amendment clarifies that a node on the second network can recognize one communication node as being on a second network while that one communication node is actually operating on the first network. The other independent claims are similarly amended

The other independent claims are similarly amended to clarify features as noted above. The claimed features are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

In further detail, independent claim 1 recites that a communication node as a base station node recognizes one communication node on a first radio network as one of its own constituent elements (for example a Sub Unit) and discloses its own configuration information to another communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus), such that the another communication node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) recognizes the one communication node on the first network (radio network) as if it is a constituent element (for example a Sub Unit) of the claimed communication node on the second network (for example the IEEE 1394 bus) on the second network while said one communication node is actually operating on the first network (radio network). In other words, the one communication node is not recognized as existing on the first network, although it is actually on the first network, but instead is viewed as if it is a part of the communication node on the second network.

Similarly to independent claim 1 as noted above, independent claim 8 recites a communication node as a base station node that discloses first configuration information regarding constituent elements (for example Sub Units) in one communication node on a first radio network as its own constituent elements (for example the Sub Units), to another communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus), and/or discloses second configuration information regarding constituent elements (for example the Sub Units) in the other communication node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) as its own constituent element (for example the Sub Units), to the one communication node on the first network (radio network). In other words, the communication node of claim 8 provides configuration information disclosing a function

similar to that of the communication node of claim 1, with respect to both communication nodes on both networks.

With respect to independent claim 16, independent claim 16 recites a communication node as a base station node that transfers data to be exchanged between a processing unit and an application executed on another communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus), through a first interface unit connected to a first radio network, such that the one communication node connected to the first network (the radio network) is handled as if it is connected to the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) on the second network while said one communication node is actually operating on the first network. In other words, claim 16 recites a communication node that transfers data to the one communication node on the first network (radio network), on behalf of an application that is executed at another communication node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus).

With respect to independent claim 19, independent claim 19 recites a communication network terminal, which is a radio terminal, that communicates with a communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus), discloses functions in the communication terminal as Sub Units in an AV/C protocol executed on an IEEE 1394 bus, and receives information regarding the Sub Units existing in that communication node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus), while making a connection to a communication node on a first radio network. In other words, in claim 19 the communication terminal is connected to the first network (the radio network), but is also capable of communicating with a node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) through a communication node (e.g. a base station node), similarly as in claims 1 and 8, by disclosing its own functions as if they are Sub Units on the IEEE 1394 bus.

With respect to independent claim 22, independent claim 22 recites a communication terminal, which is a radio terminal, that communicates with a communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus) and executes an application on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus), while making a connection to a communication node on a first radio network. In other words, in claim 22 the communication terminal is actually connected to the first network (the radio network), but is also capable of communicating with a node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) through a communication node (e.g. a base station node), by executing an application on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) at the communication terminal itself.

Each of the above-noted claims is believed to clearly distinguish over the teachings in Srivastava in view of Eilley.

In contrast to the claimed features noted above, Srivastava discloses a control system in which, for example, a device abstraction (abstract device) of a class C device is downloaded to a class D device and executed on the class D device. That is, according to Srivastava a part of a functionality of the class C device is transported into the class D device and operated on the class D device as a real part of the class D device.[1] In other words, in Srivastava a class B device can recognize a device abstraction of a class C device as part of a class D device while the device abstraction is actually operating on the class D device, because the device abstraction is indeed a transported real part of the class D device.

Thereby, in Srivastava the device abstraction of the class C device is actually downloaded to the class D device and thus become a transported real part of the class D device.

[1] See for example Srivastava at page 9, line 20 et seq.

The present invention des not have such a structure or operation as in Srivastava.

In the claimed invention a base station can voluntarily recognize one communication node on the first network as one of its constituent element, and can voluntarily disclose its own configuration information to another communication node on the second network such that the one communication node is recognized as a part of the claimed communication node on the second network by another communication node on the second network, but while the one communication node or terminal is ***actually operating on the first network***. That is, in the claimed invention there is no real transportation of a device abstraction from one class device to another class device such as in Srivastava. Thus, the claimed features distinguish over the basis for the rejection citing Srivastava.

Moreover, no teachings in Eilley are cited with respect to the above-noted features, nor any features in Eilley believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Srivastava. Eilley is merely cited for and is merely directed to showing a radio network and a non-radio network, in general. Eilley is not cited with respect to the deficiencies of Srivastava noted above, and is not believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Srivastava.

In view of these foregoing comments, the claims as currently written are believed to clearly distinguish over Srivastava in view of Eilley.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
EHK/SNS:sih

I:\ATTY\SNS\0039\00397268\00397268.AM.DOC